DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 290 187 CS 506 017

AUTHOR McDowell, Earl E.; Mrozla, Bridget A.
TITLE An Exploratory Study of the Academic Resume and Employment Interview Practices.
PUB DATE Nov 87
NOTE 40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (73rd, Boston, MA, November 5-8, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Communication Skills; Employment Interviews; Employment Practices; *Employment Qualifications; *Evaluation Criteria; Faculty Recruitment; Higher Education; Interpersonal Communication; Job Applicants; *Job Application; *Resumes (Personal)
IDENTIFIERS *Academic Professions

ABSTRACT

A study examined the academic hiring process from the perspectives of department heads, search committee members, and newly hired faculty. Respondents, 349 academic professionals at a large university in the Midwest, completed a questionnaire developed for the study to determine (1) the importance and ordering of information categories on academic resumes; (2) the importance of various evaluation criteria; (3) the verbal and nonverbal items that make the greatest impression on search committee members; (4) the importance of providing specific categories of information to candidates; (5) the importance of obtaining specific categories from candidates; and (6) the desirability of certain interviewing techniques. Results indicated that publications and references were perceived as the most important categories on the academic resume, while communication skills, intelligence, and credibility were the most important evaluation criteria. Fluency of speech, composure, organization of materials, and verbal explanations were the most important variables in impression formation. Findings showed no significant differences between sexes or among academic rank groups in rating interviewing technique variables. (Tables of data and references are appended.) (Author/NKA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED290187

An Exploratory Study of the Academic Resume and Employment Interview Practices

Earl E. McDowell

Department of Rhetoric

University of Minnesota

St. Paul, Minnesota

Bridget A. Mrozla

Department of Communication

Purdue University

West Lafayette, Indiana

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl E. McDowell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the

Speech Communication Association, 6 November 1987, Boston.

Running Head: The Academic Resume and Employment Interview Practices

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS506017

Abstract

This study examines the academic hiring process from the perspectives of department heads, search committee members, and newly hired faculty. Respondents completed questionnaires indicating (1) the importance of information categories on the academic resume and how the categories ideally should be ordered, (2) the importance of various evaluation criteria, (3) the verbal and nonverbal items that make the greatest impression on search committee members, (4) the importance of providing specific categories of information to candidates, (5) the importance of obtaining specific categories of information from candidates, and (6) the desirability of certain interviewing techniques.

Overall, the results indicate that publications and references are perceived as the most important categories on the academic resume, while communication skills, intelligence, and credibility are the most important evaluation criteria. Fluency of speech, composure, organization of materials, and verbal explanations are most important variables in impression formation. Specific perceptual differences between biological sex groups and academic rank groups for the search committee's responsibilities regarding academic employment interviewing are also discussed in this paper.

Over the past six decades industrial and organizational psychologists have investigated the hiring process, focusing on the resume and the employment interview and attempting to assess the validity and reliability of these components in selection decisions. While much research has been conducted in business and industrial settings, only a limited amount has examined the hiring process in the academic sector, particularly at the post-secondary level. Even given today's Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) guidelines, evidence suggests that employment interviewing remains a highly subjective procedure. For example, one study by Jarchow (1981) found that hiring biases occurred frequently during employment interviews for academic positions, with preferential treatment given to married persons, persons with extracurricular activity expertise, and to well-groomed, physically attractive candidates. Anectdotal accounts by faculty suggest that, in many cases, search committee members do not conduct their employment interviews in a standardized, structured manner that would ensure equal treatment and consideration for all candidates. A number of articles provide intuitive, common-sense advice for interviewing candidates for elementary and secondary faculty positions (see Bredeson, 1985, Ferguson, 1983; Kopetskie, 1983; Maguire, 1983; Poteet, 1983; and Vornberg & Liles, 1983), many using a "this is what worked for us" approach. Very few, however, have used systematic, empirical investigation to arrive at their conclusions.

This study examines the academic hiring process at the post-secondary level and evaluates the importance of various factors of the academic resume and employment interview from the perspectives of university department heads, search committee members, and newly hired faculty. We will begin by

summarizing some of the research that has been completed on the hiring process, both in general and in the academic setting.

The Resume

The selection process typically begins with screening applicants' resumes. The resume is a vehicle for presenting an organized summary of an individual's professional objectives, abilities, and background (Issel, 1974). In essence, the resume acts as an "agent" to represent the job applicant to a potential employer (Rivers, 1981; Rogers & Sincoff, 1978). The function of the resume is to create a favorable impression that leads to a job interview. In a survey of the first one-hundred Fortune 500 companies, Mansfield (1975) concluded that, ideally, the resume for a business position should include a list of previous employers and job descriptions, college grade-point-average, awards, reasons for leaving previous jobs, memberships in professional organizations and offices, a list of special skills, salary desired, and state the applicant's willingness to relocate.

The academic resume, however, often includes information that would not normally appear on a business resume. While limited research on the academic resume for college faculty positions has been conducted, one study reported that the number of publications, especially senior authorship, along with work experiences and papers presented were perceived as the most important factors in determining who would be selected for subsequent interviews for faculty positions (Quereshi, Buckley, & Fadden, 1981). In another investigation, however, the quality of research, specific needs of the departments, number of publications, and letters of recommendation were the most important factors (Hlesges, Sanchez, & Stanton, 1982). Interestingly, teaching experience was not considered a key factor in selecting candidates, nor did this research address the

interviewing practices of search committee members. Overall, there does not appear to be a consensus regarding the contents of the "ideal" academic resume.

The Employment Interview

After resumes have been screened, the most promising candidates are offered the opportunity to interview for the position. Numerous articles have summarized the "state-of-the-art" of employment interviewing research (see Arvey & Campion, 1982; Goodall & Goodall, 1982; Mayfield, 1964; Schmitt, 1976; Wagner, 1949; Wright, 1969). These reviews offer guidelines for conducting effective employment interviews in a valid and reliable manner. For example, they encourage the use of pre-developed interview guides and a structured interviewing approach, as interviewers must structure their interviews around job-related questions which will allow the applicants to demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and abilities (Bucalo, 1978). Similarly, structured interviews provide a higher inter-rater reliability than other forms of interviewing, and help interviewers withhold judgment until the close of the interview (Beach, 1980; Pellicer, 1981).

Communication factors that affect the interviewing process have been the focus of other research. The job applicant's nonverbal communicative behavior during the interview is an important determinant of success (Washburn & Hakel, 1973). Eye contact, facial expressions, personal appearance, attire, paralinguistic cues, gesturing, and smiling are the most important nonverbal cues in impression-formation and decision-making in the employment interview (Carl, 1980; Imada & Hakel, 1977; Watson & Smeltzer, 1982). Rapport with the interviewer is best established through the use of eye contact (Hatfield & Gatewood, 1978).

Recruiters are also impressed to a greater degree with applicants perceptual differences and fluency rather than with substantive data, such as knowledge of the job (Tschirgi, 1973). One study used discriminant function analysis with seven message variables to determine their importance relative to each other (Hollandsworth, Kazelskis, Stevens, & Dressel, 1979). In descending order the variables were (a) appropriateness of content, (b) fluency of speech, (c) composure, (d) body posture, (e) eye contact, (f) loudness of voice, and (g) personal appearance. Of these, the first three contributed significantly to the decision to employ the individual. In a similar study, resume credentials and verbal behavior contributed most to the employment decision (Rasmussen, 1984). Of course, various employers may request specific types of information from applicants. In one academic study, 90 percent of administrators believed that candidates for elementary and secondary teaching positions need to develop and be able to elucidate a philosophy of education and should dress appropriately for the interview as well (Dewey & Gardner, 1983). Regardless, successful interviewees tend to display communication behaviors that identify with those of the potential employer, such as through supporting arguments, clarifying ideas, and good organization of content (Einhorn, 1981). Additionally, applicants should use active verbs, concrete language, personal experiences, statistics, and clear explanations during interviews.

While communicative behaviors of the interviewee have been examined, fewer investigations have focused on the importance of verbal, nonverbal, and paraverbal communication of the interviewer in the employment interview. An interviewee's first impressions of a recruiter are key factors in the decision to accept a job offer (Rogers & Sincoff, 1978), since applicants tend to transfer

their impressions of the interviewer to the company. The interviewer becomes the symbol for the company, more important than company literature (Downs, 1969). Applicants who get "turned off" during their initial contact with the company are less likely to continue seeking employment there (Wanous, 1980). Character and composure appear to be the most important credibility variables for the interviewer (Jablin & Tengler, 1982).

Limited research has focused on the asking and answering of questions by both the interviewer and interviewee during the employment interview, the function of which is to allow both parties to get at subject matter and to achieve their purposes and goals (Stewart & Cash, 1985). The interviewer can control the communication in the interview by the types of questions and the sequence used. For example, in one study Tengler and Jablin (1983) concluded that interviewers asked more primary and closed questions during the first part of the interview, and more secondary and open questions during later segments of the interview. The interviewee in this situation has more opportunity to elaborate on his or her responses toward the end of the interview, perhaps after the interviewer has already made a tentative decision as to whether to hire the individual.

The Group Interview

Edison (1984) noted that search committee members have the responsibility to meet and to determine in detail the criteria for academic positions. He recommended the use of a structured interview for hiring faculty. Although very little research focuses on the interviewing practices of search committees, a number of studies have focused on group interviews as an improved technique for hiring decisions. The use of group interviews appears to be a

promising means of improving the reliability and validity of the interviews (Arvey & Campion, 1982, Schmitt, 1976) beyond that of the traditional, one-on-one interviewing encounter. These researchers also claim that a job analysis helps in the development of questions and improves the accuracy of the interviews. Reported reliabilities for group interviews have ranged from .54 to .85 (Anstey, 1977; Reynolds, 1979; Rothstein & Jackson, 1980).

Overall, little research has focused on the relative importance of various categories of information on the academic resume, nor has research examined the interviewing practices of search committee members during interviews for faculty positions. The present study has attempted to determine what factors are important in the academic resume and how information should be ordered on the resume. Next, this study investigates the criteria for evaluating candidates during academic employment interviews. Specifically, we wanted to know which verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors made the greatest impression on search committee members during the interviews, what information should the search committee provide to and gather from the candidate, and what interviewing techniques are most desirable. The following research questions served as the basis for this inquiry.

Research Questions

We were interested in obtaining and comparing the perceptions of faculty with administrative experience (i.e., department heads/chairs), search committee members, and faculty who had been hired relatively recently, operationalized as hired within the past five years. We were also interested in any perceptual differences between biological sex groups (male and female) and among academic rank groups (assistant, associate, and full professors).

R1: Are there significant differences among academic experience groups, between biological sex groups, and among academic rank groups for (a) rating the level of importance of categories of information on the academic resume, (b) ordering these categories as they should appear on the resume, (c) rating the level of importance of evaluation criteria for interviewing candidates, (d) selecting the verbal and nonverbal communication behaviors that make the greatest impression on search committees, (e) rating the level of importance of categories of information that search committees should provide to candidates, (f) rating the importance of information that search committees should obtain from candidates, and (g) rating the desirability of selected interviewing techniques?

R2: Are there significant differences among academic experience groups, between biological sex groups, and among academic rank groups in rating the factors obtained for (a) resume categories, (b) candidate evaluation criteria, (c) verbal/nonverbal impression formation, (d) categories of information to provide/obtain, and (e) interviewing techniques?

R3: What are the correlations among factors?

R4: What is the linear relationship among factors for (a) resume categories, (b) candidate evaluation criteria, and (c) categories of information to provide/obtain?

R5: What is the linear relationship between factors for (a) interviewer information and (b) interviewing techniques?

Method

This study took place at a large midwestern university. Initially, we sent a cover letter and a current list of departmental faculty to a sample of 50

department heads/chairs and requested them to identify faculty who (a) had served on search committees for tenure-track positions, and/or (b) had been hired within the past five years. Forty-four of the heads/chairs (88%) provided the information from which we generated our pool of search committee members and new faculty. Two months later, we sent 580 faculty members (44 heads, 346 search committee members, and 190 new faculty) the Academic Selection Process Questionnaire (ASPQ) which we developed for this study. These questionnaires were completed anonymously and color-coded to identify respondent groups.

Instrument

The ASPQ consisted of six sections: (1) Resume categories and contents, (2) Academic interviewee evaluation criteria, (3) Verbal and nonverbal communicative behaviors, (4) Information to provide to candidates, (5) Information to obtain from candidates, and (6) Interviewing techniques.

In Section One, respondents rated on a five-point Likert scale the level of importance of ten categories of information that are commonly included in the resume. Previous research by Klesges, Sanchez, and Stanton (1982), McDowell (1987), Wells, Spinks, and Hargraves (1981), Stewart and Cash (1985), and Vaughn (1984) served as a basis for selecting these items. Next, respondents ranked the six most common categories in the order the categories ideally should appear on the resume (1= item should appear first, 6= last).

Section Two asked respondents to rate on a five-point Likert scale the level of importance of criteria used during interviews to evaluate candidates for faculty positions. Research by Klesges, Sanchez, and Stanton (1982) and Stewart and Cash (1985) provided items such as past achievements, internal

characteristics, and physical characteristics.

Section Three asked respondents to select from two lists the three verbal and three nonverbal communication behaviors that they believed make the greatest impression on search committee members. These items were obtained from previous studies by Carl (1980), Hatfield and Gatewood (1978), Hollandsworth et al. (1979), Imada and Hakel (1977), and Watson and Smeltzer (1982), which concluded that nonverbal cues play a significant role in impression-formation during employment interviews. These same sources, as well as Einhorn (1981) and Rasmussen (1984), were used to develop the verbal behavior items.

Section Four asked respondents to indicate on a five-point Likert scale the level of importance of categories of information that the search committee should provide to candidates. While Edison (1984) has advised search committees to report selection decisions more quickly to applicants for faculty positions, a review of literature did not uncover research addressing the responsibility of search committees to provide specific categories of information to candidates during the selection interview. In this study, respondents indicated the level of importance of providing information pertaining to the university, department, and community.

Section Five focused on the importance for search committees to obtain the candidate's educational philosophy, self-assessment, and information about previous jobs and work relationships. A review of articles by Hamachek (1975) and Mickler and Solomon (1985) along with informal discussions with faculty members were used to generate these items. Respondents rated the importance of each item on a five-point Likert scale.

Finally, Section Six focused on the interviewing situation itself in terms of

how desirable certain techniques are when interviewing candidates for faculty positions. Respondents were asked to rate on a five-point Likert scale the desirability of these items, including the structure of the interview, question types, and question sequences. These items were generated from research in interviewing (McComb & Jablin, 1984, Stewart & Cash, 1985; Tengler & Jablin, 1983).

Statistical Analysis

Frequencies, the Mann-Whitney U test, the Kruskus Wallis analysis of variance, chi-square analysis, factor analysis, discriminant function analysis, and canonical correlations were completed on the data. The Mann-Whitney U test can be used when at least ordinal measurement has been achieved (Siegel, 1956). To find U, scores are ranked in order of increasing size. In this study, the Mann-Whitney U test was used to determine differences between biological sex groups for the Likert-scaled items. Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance is similar to the U test, but it is used when there are three or more groups of the independent variable. This statistic was used to determine differences among academic groups and among academic rank groups. Additionally, chi-square analyses were computed to determine differences between and among levels of independent variables for nominal data.

Next, factor analyses were completed on the data. The oblique factor analysis with the pattern matrix delineates the clustering of variables to determine the direct contribution of a given factor to the variance of a variable (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrener, & Bent, 1975).

Canonical correlations and discriminant function analyses were completed. Multivariate analysis is superior to univariate analysis as it can handle many

variables simultaneously, whereas univariate analysis slows the process of structure analysis (Wimmer, 1972). Discriminant analysis maximizes the differences between groups on variables included as predictors.

Finally, stepwise discriminant analyses were used in this study. Initially, the best discriminating variable was selected. Next, a second variable was selected from the remaining variables using criteria that would improve the multivariate *F* in combination with the first. This process is repeated until all significant variables are selected. Bartlett's chi-square test is also computed. Through this process the optimum discriminant function maximizes the ratio of the among group sums of squares to the within groups sums of squares. Likewise, through canonical correlational analyses, the linear relationships between two sets of variables can be determined.

Results

In this study 349 (61%) of the original sample completed and returned the questionnaire. This included 212 (64%) of search committee members, 108 (57%) of new faculty, and 29 (66%) of administrators (heads/chairs). The breakdown for biological sex was 282 (80%) males and 67 (20%) females. For academic rank the breakdown was 80 (23%) assistant professors, 83 (24%) associate professors, and 186 (53%) full professors.

Tables 1 through 8 present item-by-item reports of the results. Table 1 focuses on the academic resume. Condensing the response categories of "important" and "very important" indicates that over 90 percent of respondents believed that educational background, research background, a list of publications, academic employment history are important categories of information to include in the resume. There were no significant differences

between biological sex groups and among academic rank groups in rating these items; however, search committee members and department heads rated the personal information category significantly more important ($p < .05$) than did the new faculty.

Respondents' overall preference for the "ideal" ordering of the six most commonly used categories of information on the resume was (1) career objectives, (2) references, (3) teaching experience, (4) publications/description of research, (5) educational background, and (6) personal information. Significant differences ($p < .05$) occurred between male and female professors in ordering teaching experience, references, publications/description of research, and personal information categories. No significant differences occurred among academic experience groups and academic rank groups in ordering the resume categories.

Next, respondents rated items that serve as criteria for evaluating candidates during employment interviews. As reported in Table 2, over 90 percent believed that communication skills, intelligence, potential for future achievement, maturity, and credibility are important as criteria to evaluate candidates. Over 80 percent believed that educational training, work experience, personality characteristics, publications, papers presented, emotional stability, and confidence are important variables for evaluating candidates. No significant differences occurred among academic experience groups in rating these items. Male respondents, however, indicated that the sex of the candidate was significantly more important ($p < .006$) as an evaluation variable than did the female respondents. Full professors also were more likely to regard biological sex, educational training, publications, papers presented, and emotional

stability as important selection variables ($p < .01$) than were assistant and associate professors.

Respondents were asked to select the three nonverbal and paraverbal and the three verbal communication behaviors that they believed have the greatest impact in impression formation. These results, reported in Table 3, reveal that fluency of speech, composure, organization of material, and explanations are the most important variables for impression formation. There were no significant differences among academic experience or rank groups, but female professors believed that eye contact was significantly more important ($p < .01$) in making a favorable impression than did the male professors.

Table 4 reports respondents' perceptions of the importance of various information that search committees should provide to candidates. Over 90 percent believed that it is important for search committees to describe the opportunities for research, teaching, advancement, and the short- and long-term department goals, and to give a tour of the department. Over 80 believed that salary and benefits, an overview of the curriculum, and the support staff available were important items to explain to candidates. No significant differences occurred among respondent groups in rating these items.

Table 5 reports the respondents' perceptions of the importance of various information that search committee members should obtain from candidates for faculty positions. Over 90 percent believed that involvement with research, knowledge of the discipline, attitudes towards students, and problem-solving ability are essential categories of information to obtain during the employment interview. In addition, over 80 percent believed that previous teaching

experience, philosophy of teaching, and relationships with co-workers should be obtained from candidates. There were no significant differences among respondent groups in rating these items.

Table 6 reports respondents' attitudes toward specific interviewing techniques. In addition to the overall results, over 70 percent of the search committee respondent group believed that search committees should develop at least some of their questions prior to the interview, use open-ended questions, conduct one-on-one interviews, conduct group interviews, and should begin with general questions and move to specific questions. Although much variance occurred among respondents, no significant differences occurred between academic experience and rank groups in rating these items. Female professors, however, believed that the one-on-one interview and EEO guidelines were significantly more important ($p < .01$) variables than did the male professors.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was first completed on the results for ranking the importance of categories of information on the academic resume. Two factors accounting for 86 percent of the variance were obtained. These factors were labeled "Research Skills" (with the items/loadings list of publications, .78; awards/honors, .52) and "Personal Goals" (personal information, .49; college transcripts, .46; career objectives, .45; and salary desired, .45).

Regarding criteria used to evaluate candidates, three factors accounting for 93 percent of the variance were obtained. These factors and their items were "Past Achievements" (publications, .82; awards/honors, .70; papers presented, .70; educational training, .67; and work experience, .67), "Internal

Characteristics" (emotional stability, .71; credibility, .62; confidence, .56; and maturity, .41), and "Personal Characteristics" (appearance .65; personality characteristics, .58; communication skills, .47; and biological sex, .40).

Three factors were obtained for categories of information that the search committee should gather from candidates for faculty positions. These factors were "Educational Philosophy" (philosophy of teaching, .82; philosophy of education, .82; and attitude toward students, .41), "Job Relationships" (relationships with supervisors, .85; and with co-workers, .83), and "Self-Assessment" (candidate's perceptions of own weaknesses, .89; and strengths, .87). The three factors accounted for 77 percent of the variance.

Additional factor analysis was completed to assess the perceived responsibilities of search committees in terms of providing information to candidates. These results reveal that "Department Variables" (salary/benefits, .76; department budget, .47; advancement, .46; and committee duties, .43) and "Environmental Orientations" (support staff, .74; and tour of department, .61) controlled for 73 percent of the variance.

Finally, factor analysis was completed on the results for interviewing techniques. Two factors, accounting for 77 percent of the variance, were obtained. "Planning Techniques" (predevelop all questions, .63; use standard set of questions, .56; and create a stressful environment, .45) and "Initial Questioning Approach" (ask specific questions before general questions; .83 ask general questions before specific questions, .69).

Disriminant Analysis

The discriminant analysis results reveal that significant differences occurred among academic experience groups ($\chi^2 = 15.91$; $df = 10$; $p < .001$; $R = .23$)

on the dependent measures. The discriminant function classified 40.6% correctly into the three respondent categories. Results for one-way analysis of variance between levels of academic experience groups are reported in Table 7. Significant differences occurred between academic experience groups in rating all factors except for "Personal Characteristics," "Job Relationships," and "Planning Techniques." We will amplify on specific differences between levels of the independent variable in the discussion section.

The discriminant analysis results between biological sex groups indicated significant differences ($\chi^2 = 5.62$; $df = 2$; $p < .05$; $R = .22$) between male and female professors in rating "Past Achievement," "Personality Characteristics," "Self-Assessment," "Initial Questioning," and "Educational Philosophy." Approximately 60 percent of the cases were correctly classified.

Discriminant analysis results for academic rank groups indicated significant differences ($\chi^2 = 8.64$; $df = 4$; $p < .01$; $R = .27$), with approximately 47 percent of the cases correctly classified. Table 8 reports ANOVA results between academic rank groups, with significant differences in rating "Research Skills," "Internal Characteristics," "Educational Philosophy," and "Self-Assessment" factors.

Correlational Results

The canonical correlations produced no significant or meaningful results. *Post hoc* analyses using the Pearson correlation coefficients revealed significant relationships between "Internal Characteristics" ($r = .47$; $p < .001$), between "Past Achievements" and "Research Skills" ($r = .27$; $p < .01$), and between "Past Achievements" and "Personal Characteristics" ($r = .25$; $p < .01$). Significant differences also occurred between "Department Variables" and

"Environmental Orientations" (r = .30; p < .01), between "Educational Philosophy" and "Self-Assessment" (r = .38; p < .001), between "Educational Philosophy" and "Job Satisfaction" (r = .29, p < .01), and between "Planning Techniques" and "Initial Questioning Approach" (r = .32; p < .001).

Discussion

The results of this study indicate that there are perceptual differences concerning the academic hiring process among the respondent groups of department heads, search committee members, and new faculty. There are also perceptual differences regarding the resume and employment interview between academic groups and recruiters in the business world. For example, previous research has found that professional recruiters consider personal information very important for inclusion on the resume (Hakel, Dobymer, & Dunnette, 1970; McDowell, 1987, Rogers & Sincoff, 1978; Vaughn, 1984), while in the present study it was much less important for the academic resume. Conversely, all academic groups place a major emphasis on references, while professional recruiters gave references only minor consideration.

As noted previously, this study found that the most important criteria to evaluate candidates for faculty positions are candidates' communication skills, intelligence, and credibility. About one-half of the respondents believed that appearance was important, while the sex of the candidate was the least important consideration in hiring decisions. Candidates' fluency of speech, composure, organization of material, and explanations were regarded as the communication behaviors that have the greatest impact on impression formation during interviews. These findings are similar to those obtained in previous studies (Hollandsworth et al., 1979; Rasmussen, 1984).

The results of the discriminant function analyses indicated significant differences among academic groups as to their ratings of nine of the academic selection process factors. There were significant differences for the resume factors between (a) search committee members and new faculty, and (b) administrators (heads/chairs) and new faculty. An examination of the means indicates that new faculty considered these factors more important than did the other academic groups. The composite results suggest that all academic groups consider research background and a list of publications as essential information to include on the resume.

Significant differences also occurred among academic groups in rating the level of importance of using various evaluation criteria during the academic employment interview. Significant differences occurred among academic groups in rating the level of importance for the "Past Achievement" factor, and among groups for academic experience, biological sex, and academic rank in rating the "Internal Characteristics" factor. Again, there were significant differences between (a) search committee members and administrators, and (b) new faculty, and between (a) assistant and associate professors, and (b) full professors. Specifically, search committee members, administrators, and full professors considered internal variables pertaining to candidates as more important criteria than did the other respondent groups. The factor analytic results indicated that the "Internal Characteristics" factor accounted for 28 percent of the variance. This factor also contained the highest means for its items, suggesting that perceptions of candidates' emotional stability, confidence, credibility, and maturity are the most important criteria used to evaluate candidates for faculty positions.

The results for the "Personal Characteristics" factor reveal that male respondents considered personality and communication skills more important than did the female respondents. Females, however, considered the sex of the candidate and personal appearance as more important evaluation criteria.

Significant differences also occurred for all three independent variables in rating the importance of information categories on the "Educational Philosophy" and "Self-Assessment" factors. These were the best discriminating variables among the academic groups. Administrators and search committee members believed that philosophy of education and teaching, as well as attitudes toward students, were more important than did the new faculty. Male professors and full professors also believed that "Educational Philosophy" was significantly more important than did the female professors.

Similar results occurred in rating the "Self-Assessment" factor. Administrators and search committee members, as well as male professors and full professors, were more likely to indicate that candidates' assessment of their own strengths and weaknesses was more important, as compared to the ratings given by new faculty, female professors, and assistant professors.

No significant differences occurred bewteen biological sex groups and among academic rank groups in rating interviewing technique variables. Significant differences occurred among all respondent groups in rating the "Initial Questioning" factor. The mean results suggest that new faculty prefer interviewers to begin with questions of a general nature and then move toward more specific questions. On the other hand, administrators and search committee members believe that the interview should begin with specific questions and move toward more general questions. The item-by-item analysis

also indicated differences among respondent groups. Approximately 60 percent of the new faculty thought it was desirable to use a standard set of questions for interviewing candidates, whereas about 40 percent of administrators and search committee members felt that it was a desirable technique. In addition, administrators and new faculty members indicated a greater preference for developing a chart for comparing candidates than did the search committee members. Overall, only marginal differences existed among groups in their perceptions of interviewing techniques.

Perhaps more important than the differences among the respondent groups are the differences between the groups. For example, 32 percent of the respondents felt that it was undesirable or were undecided about following EEO guidelines, despite the potential for litigation if discrimination is suspected in the hiring decision (Arvey, 1979). Likewise, about 50 percent felt that it was undesirable or were undecided about developing a chart to compare candidates after conducting the interviews.

Conclusion

This was an exploratory study designed to discover the level of importance of various categories of information to be included on the academic resume and to indicate how information should be ordered on the resume. Additionally, this study examined the importance of various types of evaluation criteria, the communication behaviors that contribute to impression formation, the types of information that search committees need to provide to and obtain from candidates, and the desirability of selected interviewing techniques.

Overall, the results suggest that candidates for faculty positions should develop resumes that focus on research background, provide a list of publications, and

include academic employment history and educational background. Unlike previous research in the non-academic, business sector, academic administrators and search committee members want references to be listed, but feel that salary desired and personal information are relatively unimportant categories of information.

Beyond the resume, much similarity exists between non-academic employemnt recruiters and search committee members in terms of how both would evaluate candidates for available positions. Major emphasis is placed on communication skills, confidence, intelligence, credibility, maturity, and potential for future achievement, as well as educational training, work experience, and personality characteristics. Biological sex and candidates' personal appearance were perceived as less important considerations in the academic sector than would be the case in business.

The nonverbal and verbal communication results are similar to those reported in previous research. It is important to remember, however, that in this study respondents selected the three nonverbal and three verbal items that they perceived as most important in impression formation. Items that were less frequently selected, such as personal grooming, apparel, hand gestures, and firmness of handshake may still play a significant part in the overall process of impression formation. Likewise, the use of less frequently rated verbal items such as good transitions, concrete language, active verbs, and technical jargon may contribute to a favorable impression.

The information gathered during the academic employement interview expands upon the information provided by the resume. Candidates are asked for their philosophy of education and teaching, to demonstrate problem-solving

skills, to discuss previous teaching experiences, and most importantly, to amplify on involvement with research as well as provide the usual information that would be requested in a business interview.

Search committee members are responsible for providing candidates with the short- and long-range goals of the department, descriptions of opportunities for teaching and research, advancement opportunities, an overview of the curriculum, and a tour of the department facilities. Non-academic recruiters provide categories of information germane to the positions they have available.

The final part of the questionnaire used in this study focused on techniques for conducting the academic employment interview. Over 90 percent of search committee members believe that it is desirable to use a semidirective questioning strategy, but these results are somewhat contradicted in that 50 percent feel that a standard set of questions should not be used for interviewing candidates. All respondent groups indicated that it is desirable to ask open-ended questions followed by closed-ended questions. This suggests that the search committee tends to use a funnel approach to question sequencing in the initial part of the interview, and use an inverted funnel sequence toward the end. This contrasts with previous research findings (Tengler & Jablin, 1983).

Future Research

The reader should be cautioned about generalizing the results of this study to all post-secondary institutions. This study was conducted at a large, comprehensive, land-grant university that places major emphasis on research. Faculty perceptions of important criteria for hiring decisions may or may not be comparable at smaller state or private institutions. Nevertheless, the results of this study provide insights about the academic hiring process in terms of

examining specific aspects of the academic resume and academic employment interview from the perspectives of administrators, search committee members, and new faculty. Obviously, these results are useful for individuals contemplating academic employment, as they suggest ways in which applicants can make favorable impressions on search committees. Perhaps more important, however, is that this research indicates lack of consensus in specific areas, such as following EEO guidelines or using a standard set of questions to ensure equal consideration for all candidates. Future research should attempt to assess the validity and reliability of academic employment interviews conducted by search committees. Additional research could examine other specifics of the hiring process. For example, information-gathering interviewing and survey studies could be conducted to determine the ideal length and content of the interview. Other questions might focus on the responsibilities of search committee members prior to, during, and after the interview. Research could address the structure of the interview, the degree of communicative disclosure, or types and sequencing of questions from the perspectives of deans and faculty from the department conducting the search.

In conclusion, the employment interview remains a subjective procedure, both in the business and academic sectors. Administrators and search committees should be aware that the manner in which they conduct their employment interviews for faculty positions plays a significant role in either increasing or decreasing subjectivity and giving all candidates an equal opportunity for employment.

References

Anstey, E. (1977). A 30-year-follow-up of the CCSB procedure with lessons for the future. Journal of Occupational Psychology, 50, 149-159.

Arvey, R. (1979). Unfair discrimination in the employment interview: Legal and psychological aspects. Psychological Bulletin, 86, 736-765.

Arvey, R., & Campion, J. (1982). The employment interview: A summary and review of recent research. Personnel Psychology, 35, 281-322.

Beach, D. (1980). Managing People at Work: Readings in Personnel (pp 714-715). New York: MacMillan Publishing Co.

Bredeson, P. (1985). The teacher screening and selection process: A decision making model for school administrators. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 18, 8-15.

Bucalo, J. (1978). The balanced interview can be the foundation for more effective hiring of professionals and managers. Personnel Journal, 57, 424.

Campion, M. (1978). Identification of variables most influential in determining interviewers' evaluations of applicants in a college placement center. Psychological Reports, 42, 947-952.

Carl, H. (1980). Nonverbal communication during the employment interview. The ABCA Bulletin, 43(4), 14-19.

Dewey, B., & Gardner, D. (1983). Do you really want to teach? Fifteen job search rules. College Student Journal, 17, 80-82.

Downs, C. (1969). Perceptions of the selection interview. Personnel Administration, 32, 8-23.

Edison, F. (1984). Waiting to hear from the search committee. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 28, 11.

Einhorn, L. (1981). An interview of the job interview: An investigation of successful communicative behaviors. Communication Education, 30, 217-228.

Ferguson, J. (1983). Interviewing teacher candidates: 100 questions to ask. NASSP Bulletin, 67(464), 118-120.

Goodall, D., & Goodall, H. (1982). The employment interview: A selective review of the literature with implications for communications research. Communication Quarterly, 30, 116-123.

Hakel, M., Dobmeyer, T., & Dunnette, M. (1970). Relative importance of three content dimensions in overall suitability ratings of job applicants' resumes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 54, 65-71.

Hamachek, D. (1975). Characteristics of good teachers and implications for teacher education. In J. Michael Palardy, Ed., Teaching Today: Tasks and Challenges (pp. 67-76). New York: MacMillan.

Hatfield, J., & Gatewood, D. (1978). Nonverbal cues in the selection interview. The Personnel Administrator, 23, 35-37.

Hollandworth, J., Kazelskis, R., Stevens, J., & Dressel, M. (1979). Relative contributions on verbal, articulative and nonverbal communication to employment decisions in the job interview setting. Personnel Psychology, 32, 359-367.

Imada, A., & Hakel, M. (1977). Influence of nonverbal communication and rater proximity on impressions and decisions in simulated employment interviews. Journal of Applied Psychology, 62, 295-300.

Issel, C. (1974). The resume--a sales tool. Technical Communication, 1(2), 7-9.

Jablin, F., & Tengler, C. (1982). Interviewee perceptions of employment screening interviews: relationships among perceptions of communication satisfaction, interviewer credibility and trust, interviewing experience, and interview outcomes. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Boston, MA.

Jarchow, E. (1981). The hiring game. The Clearing House, 54, 366-367.

Klesges, R., Sanchez, V., & Stanton, A. (1982). Obtaining employment in academia: The hiring process and characteristics of successful applicants. Professional Psychology, 13, 577-586.

Kopetskie, T. (1983). An administrator's guide to hiring the right person. NASSP Bulletin, 67(459), 12-15.

Maguire, J. (1979). Faculty participation in staff selection. The Clearinghouse, 53(October), 81-83.

Mansfield, C. (1976). We hear you Mr./Ms. Resume. Personnel Journal, 48, 732-733.

Mayfield, C. (1964). The selection interview: A reevaluation of published research. Personnel Psychology, 17, 239-260.

McComb, K., & Jablin, F. (1984). Verbal correlates of interviewer empathic listening and employment interview outcomes. Paper presented at the International Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.

McDowell, E. (1987). Perceptions of the ideal cover letter and ideal resume. Journal of Technical Writing and Communication, 17, 179-191.

Mickler, M., & Solomon, G. (1985). Beyond credentials in teacher selection: A validation study of the Omaha Teacher Interview. North Central Association Quarterly, 59, 339-345.

Nie, H., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrener, K., & Bend, D. (1975). Statistical Packages for Social Scientists (pp. 468-508). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Pellicer, L. (1981). Improving teacher selection with the structured interview. Educational Leadership, 38, 492-494.

Poteet, G. (1983). Planning successful academic interviews. Nurse Educator, 8, 11-14.

Quereshi, M., Buckley, J., & Fadden, T. (1981). Some determinants of psychologists' employability in academic settings. Personnel Psychology, 34, 301-308.

Rasmussen, K., (1984). Nonverbal behavior, verbal behavior, resume credentials, and selection interview outcomes. Journal of Applied Psychology, 69, 551-556.

Reynolds, A. (1979). The reliability of a scored oral interview for police officers. Public Personnel Management, 8, 324-328.

Rivers, P. (1981). Resumes: Up close and personal. Security Management, 25(2), 81-82.

Rogers, D., & Sincoff, M. (1978). Favorable impression characteristics of the recruitment interview. Personnel Psychology, 31, 495-503.

Rothstein, M., & Jackson, D. (1980). Decision-making in the employment interview: An experimental approach. Journal of Applied Psychology, 65, 271-283.

Schmitt, N. (1976). Social and situational determinants of interview decisions: Implications for the employment interview. Personnel Psychology, 29, 79-101.

Siegel, S. (1956). Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences (pp. 116-119). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stewart, C., & Cash, W. (1985). Interviewing Principles and Practices (pp. 181-233). Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown.

Tengler, C., & Jablin, F. (1983). Effects of question type, orientation, sequencing in the employment screening interview. Paper presented at the International Communication Association convention, Dallas, TX.

Tschirgi, H. (1973). What do recruiters really look for in candidates? Journal of College Placement, 33, 75-79.

Vaughn, J. (1984). Important considerations in resume preparation: A study of interviewer preferences. Journal of Business Education, 59(7), 285-289.

Vornberg, J., & Liles, K. (1983). Taking inventory of your interviewing techniques. NASSP Bulletin, 67(459), 88-91.

Wagner, R. (1949). The employment interview: A critical summary. Personnel Psychology, 2, 17-46.

Wanous, J. (1980). Organizational Entry: Recruitment, Selection and Socialization of Newcomers (pp. 47-61). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Washburn, P., & Hakel, M. (1973). Visual cues and verbal content as influences in impressions found after simulated employment interviews. Journal of Applied Psychology, 58, 137-141.

Watson, K., & Smeltzer, L. (1982). Perceptions of nonverbal communication during the selection interview. The ABCA Bulletin, 45(2), 30-34.

Wells, B., Spinks, N., & Hargraves, J. (1981). A survey of the chief officers in the 500 largest corporations in the United States to determine their preferences in job application letters and personnel resumes. The ABCA Bulletin, 44(2), 3-7.

Wimmer, R. (1976). Mass media and older voters: 1972. Jobs, 313-322.

Wright, O. (1969). Summary of research on the selection interview since 1964. Personnel Psychology, 22, 391-413.

Table 1

Faculty Members' Attitudes Toward the Importance of Information Categories for Inclusion on Resumes for Academic Positions

Item	Percent indicating important/very important
Educational Background	99.4
Research Background	97.9
List of Publications	97.4
Academic Employment History	92.0
Personal References	88.9
Awards/honors	75.2
Career Objectives	71.7
College Transcripts	34.8
Personal Information	33.1
Salary Desired	16.7

Table 2

Faculty Members' Attitudes toward Criteria

to Evaluate Candidates for Faculty Positions

Item	Percent indicating important/very important
Communication Skills	96.5
Intelligence	96.5
Potential for Future Achievement	93.5
Maturity	92.9
Credibility	92.1
Confidence	86.8
Personality Characteristics	86.6
Emotional Stability	85.7
Papers Presented	84.9
Educational Training	83.9
Work Experience	83.3
Publications	83.1
Collegiality	75.5
Awards/Honors	52.4
Appearance	50.6
Sex of Candidate	7.2

Table 3

Faculty Perceptions of Verbal and Nonverbal Items That Make the Greatest Impression on Search Committee Members

Verbal Items	%	Nonverbal Items	%
Organization of Material	82.5	Fluency of Speech	59.6
Explanations	80.1	Composure	84.3
Use of Concrete Language	45.6	Eye Contact	52.1
Personal Experience	30.1	Personal Grooming	28.7
Comparisons	16.7	Body Posture	8.9
Use of Good Transitions	11.7	Vocal Pitch	5.8
Statistics	5.8	Loudness of Voice	5.3
Testimony	4.4	Firmness of Handshake	4.4
Use of Technical Jargon	4.1	Vocal Accent	3.2
Use of Active Verbs	2.0	Hand Gestures	1.5
		Apparel	1.2

Table 4

Faculty Members' Attitudes Toward Information That Search Committee Members Should Provide to Candidates

Item	Percent indicating important/very important
Description of Opportunities for Research	98.8
Description of Opportunities for Teaching	98.8
Advancement/promotion/tenure	96.8
Short- and Long-range Department Goals	96.6
Tour of Department Facilities	90.6
Salary and Benefits	89.2
Overview of Curriculum	89.0
Support Staff Available	86.0
Housing Available in Nearby Communities	67.1
Department Budget	60.8
Responsibilities to Serve on Committees	55.8
Extracurricular Opportunities Available	46.3

Table 5

Faculty Member's Attitudes Toward Information to Obtain from Candidates During Academic Employment Interviews

Item	Percent indicating important/very important
Involvement with Research	99.4
Knowledge of Discipline	97.6
Attitudes toward Students	96.2
Problem-solving Ability	90.9
Previous Teaching Experience	86.2
Philosophy of Teaching	85.0
Relationships with Co-workers	81.0
Reaction to Criticism	79.8
Candidate's Perceptions of Own Strengths	78.9
Philosophy of Education	76.5
Relationships with Supervisors	74.1
Candidate's Perceptions of Own Weaknesses	72.8
Reason for Leaving Previous Position	69.6
Salary Expectations	69.1
Health	49.7
Involvement in Extracurricular Activities	16.7
Marital Status	6.2

Table 6

Faculty Attitudes Toward Interviewing Techniques

Item	Percent indicating desirable/very desirable
Use open-ended questions	98.6
Develop some of the Qs ahead of time	94.5
Use group interviews	92.5
Use one-on-one interviews	77.0
Start with general Qs and move to specific Qs	76.8
Follow EEO guidelines	68.1
Develop chart for comparing candidates	51.6
Use standard set of Qs for all candidates	43.5
Develop all Qs ahead of time	20.7
Begin with specific Qs and move to general Qs	16.3
Develop no Qs ahead of time	15.6
Use closed-ended Qs	13.7
Create a stressful environment for interview	6.3

Table 7

ANOVA Between Administrative Experience Groups on

Academic Selection Process Factors

Factors	Groups	P
Research Skills	SC vs NF	.05
	SC vs DH	.24
	DH vs NF	.02
Personal Goals	SC vs NF	.04
	SC vs DH	.31
	DH vs NF	.02
Past Achievements	SC vs NF	.03
	SC vs DH	.47
	DH vs NF	.02
Internal Characteristics	SC vs NF	.02
	SC vs DH	.63
	DH vs NF	.04
Self-assessment	SC vs NF	.006
	SC vs DH	.85
	DH vs NF	.08
Educational Philosophy	SC vs NF	.0005
	SC vs DH	.91
	DH vs NF	.03
Department Variables	SC vs NF	.001
	SC vs DH	.23
	DH vs NF	.02
Initial Questioning	SC vs NF	.003
	SC vs DH	.05
	DH vs NF	.009
Environmental Orientation	SC vs NF	.003
	SC vs DH	.08
	DH vs NF	.02

SC - Search Committee Member
DH - Department Head
NF - New Faculty

Table 8

ANOVA Between Academic Rank Groups on

Academic Selection Process Factors

Factors	Rank Groups	P
Research Skills	AT vs AS	.51
	AT vs F	.004
	AS vs F	.004
Internal Characteristics	AT vs AS	.49
	AT vs F	.003
	AS vs F	.001
Educational Philosophy	AT vs AS	.54
	AT vs F	.02
	AS vs F	.01
Self-Assessment	AT vs AS	.54
	AT vs F	.003
	AS vs F	.02

AT - Assistant Professor
AS - Associate Professor
F - Full Professor